

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY
MEETING MINUTES
April 25, 2001
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

The meeting of the California High-Speed Rail Authority was called to order on April 25, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. at Oakland City Hall at 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, California.

Members Present: Edward P. Graveline, Vice Chairperson
 Ernest A. Bates
 Ben L. Hom
 Jerry Epstein
 William E. Leonard
 T.J. Stapleton
 Leland Wong

Members Absent: John P. Fowler

Introductory Remarks

Vice Chairperson Graveline introduced the two newest members, Mr. Ben Hom of San Francisco and Mr. Leland Wong of Los Angeles.

Approval of Minutes for January 24, 2001 Meeting

Vice Chairperson Graveline presented the minutes for approval. Member Stapleton moved to approve the minutes. Member Epstein seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Approval of Minutes for March 1, 2001 Meeting

Vice Chairperson Graveline presented the minutes for approval. Member Epstein moved to approve the minutes. Member Bates seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Authority Members' Meetings for Compensation

Vice Chairperson Graveline presented the list of meetings for compensation. Member Bates moved to approve the list. Member Epstein seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Members' Report

Vice Chairperson Graveline distributed a letter addressed to Governor Gray Davis urging his administration to make the gubernatorial appointments. Vice Chairperson Graveline motioned the letter be sent to the Governor with the board's approval. Member Epstein seconded the motion, which carried 7-0. Vice Chairperson Graveline requested Authority members be notified in advance about the meetings staff members attend. Executive Director Morshed stated staff would accommodate this request. Vice Chairperson Graveline introduced Mayor Brown of Oakland, California. Mayor Brown declared his enthusiasm for the High-Speed Rail project and his support of the scoping process.

Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Morshed gave a brief overview of the agenda. Executive Director Morshed introduced David Valentstein, Transportation Specialist, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The FRA will serve as the Authority's lead agency for the federal environmental impact statement. Executive Director Morshed reported on the current scoping process. Executive Director Morshed stated scoping process is the period in which public agencies and the public

are notified about the project. The primary objective of the scoping process is to listen to people's comments relative to their interest in the project. The release of the Notice Of Preparation (NOP), on April 6, 2001, started the state version of the environmental process. The FRA is distributing the Notice of Intent (NOI). Approximately ten scoping meetings are scheduled statewide. Executive Director Morshed stated the next board meeting would be June 20, 2001 (location to be determined). Executive Director Mehdi Morshed then drew attention to the July Board meeting, stating this meeting is going to be an important meeting because initial recommendations in terms of the screening process will be brought to the Board at that time. Executive Director Morshed reported he attended two budget committee hearings and action is postponed until the May Revision of the State budget is released. Executive Director Morshed directed attention to two bills authored by Senator Costa. The Senate Transportation Committee passed both bills:

- SB690 – Defines the technology the Authority should investigate.
- SB976 – Designates the Secretary of Business, Transportation & Housing and the Director of Caltrans as voting members of the board.

Executive Director Morshed reported the Merced to San Jose corridor has a number of difficult issues; therefore, an alternative corridor alignment must be investigated. The Authority is currently looking at an option that would begin in the Central Valley, north of Merced, and would connect to the Bay Area just south of San Jose. Executive Director Morshed will report further on this option at the July meeting.

Adoption of Revised Conflict of Interest Code

Vice Chairperson Graveline introduced George Spanos, Attorney General's Office. Mr. Spanos clarified three points:

- 1) A footnote was inadvertently missing from the first page of the revised conflict of interest code. The footnote should read: "for purposes of this conflict of interest code and its appendices, the definition of consultant is as that word is defined in Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Section 18701.
- 2) Under Appendix A, the word Commissioner should be changed to Authority Member.
- 3) Under Assigned Disclosure, Number 4 should be deleted.

Member Leonard moved to approve the adoption of the revised conflict of interest code. Member Bates seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Federal Railroad Administration Update

Vice Chairperson Graveline introduced Executive Director Morshed. Executive Director Morshed reported the Authority and the FRA have been in communication, and at the request of the FRA, a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Authority and the FRA is being presented before the Authority for approval. Executive Director Morshed reported the MOU defines the Authority's and the FRA's roles and responsibilities and allows the FRA to become a partner in the environmental process of the project. Executive Director Morshed distributed a revised draft MOU. Executive Director Morshed requested authority to sign the MOU. Member Leonard moved to authorize Executive Director Morshed to sign the MOU between the Authority and the FRA. Member Stapleton seconded the motion, which carried 7-0. David Valenstein, FRA reported the FRA has issued a Notice of Intent. Mr. Valenstein stated the FRA has a commitment to work in partnership with the Authority, and the FRA is pleased to be part of this important project.

Review and Approval of Public Outreach Contract Request for Proposal

Deputy Director John Barna gave an overview of the draft Request for Proposal and recommended the Authority approve the Request for Proposal for the public outreach contract. Member Leonard moved to approve the RFP. Member Hom seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Review and Approval of Consulting Teams Draft Work Plan

Vice Chairperson introduced Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director. Deputy Director Leavitt reported this is the last of five draft work plans to be approved. Deputy Director Leavitt stated this work plan is consistent with the work plans previously reviewed and approved by the Authority. Dan Leavitt introduced Steve Schibuola, Project Manager of the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego corridor. Mr. Schibuola introduced members of the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego program EIR team and presented the draft work plan for the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego corridor. A copy of this presentation is available upon request.

Public Comment

Paul Brooks

Mr. Brooks questioned Mr. Schibuola about the noise and speed of the train that would run through the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego corridor. Mr. Schibuola reported although there have been considerable advances in terms of sound mitigation, the trains still make some noise and because of the density of the urban area, the trains would not run full speed through the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego corridor.

Member Wong moved to approve the draft work plan. Member Bates seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Town Hall Report

Vice Chairperson introduced Deputy Director John Barna. Deputy Director John Barna reported the Town Hall meetings were held February 5th through April 11th, in conjunction with the Authority's public outreach team lead by Townsend, Rainmundo, Besler and Usher along with McNally Temple and Associates and California Elected Women's Association for Education and Research (CEWAR). Deputy Director John Barna introduced Kris Deutschman, Partner, Townsend, Rainmundo, Besler and Usher. Deputy Director John Barna reported the following trends heard at the Town Hall meetings:

- The coordination between both the regional and state transportation projects need to be improved
- The need to look at a high-speed train project is long overdue
- More information about corridor alignment options and station location options need to be made available
- The public desires more outreach efforts to keep them informed of the project
- All seventeen areas visited, want their respective areas to be the first on the list for high-speed trains
- No-build is not an alternative at all
- There remains a lot of confusion in terms of what type of trains the state is considering. Most people want trains like Europe has and don't understand why the state is considering (Maglev) something that hasn't even been built.

Deputy Director John Barna reported the Town Hall meetings were a successful effort to generate some attention and awareness and momentum as we enter the scoping process.

Public Comment

Beatrice Siev, South Pasadena Transportation Commission

Ms. Siev drew attention to a newspaper article, "Flaws in Region's Transit Plan May Jeopardize Funds", Los Angeles Times, April 22, 2001. Ms. Siev also expressed her opposition to SCAG/Maglev project.

Margaret Okuzumi, Peninsula Rail 2000

Ms. Okuzumi commented on legislation regarding the Transbay terminal. Ms. Okuzumi stated AB1419 was passed with some crippling amendments. One of the amendments stipulated the replacement of the Bay Bridge be completed before funding for the Transbay Terminal and the transfer of land from Caltrans to the San Francisco Redevelopment Authority could proceed. Ms. Okuzumi declared the Transbay terminal project is key to the success of the high-speed rail extending into San Francisco. Ms. Okuzumi expressed the high-speed rail project will not be nearly as successful if it only extends to 4th and Townsend. Therefore, Ms. Okuzumi requested that the Authority communicate with the Legislature in Sacramento to keep the Transbay Terminal project moving forward.

Richard Mlynarik, Regional Alliance for Transit (RAFT)

Mr. Mlynarik requested all authority and consultant reports, and memoranda be provided on the world- wide web in a timely fashion.

Mr. Paul Brooks

Mr. Brooks stated any individual academic who has analyzed this high-speed rail project has criticized the project, stating it will be a disaster. Mr. Brooks expressed his amazement at the progress of this project, which he feels is bound to be a disaster. Executive Director Morshed stated many of the same professors published reports and continue to publish reports that BART was and still is a disaster. However, Executive Director Morshed suggested taking a poll of Bay Area residents and to ask them if they feel BART is a disaster.

Norman Rolfe, San Francisco Tomorrow

Mr. Rolfe stressed how important he felt rebuilding the Transbay terminal is to the success of high-speed rail. Mr. Rolfe expressed his vision of upgrading Caltrain and coming up the Caltrain route through Transbay Terminal and somehow connecting with the East Bay. With Los Angeles, San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland and Sacramento all in one line, the system would reach maximum potential in terms of ridership. Mr. Rolfe stated he is aware of the opposition from the Legislature but urged the Authority to look at the big picture and get AB 1419 passed without the amendments.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.